DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 133 255 SO 009 666

AUTHOR Perren, Ann S.; White, Louise G.
TITLE Partnership Models for Faculty Development.
PUB DATE Nov 76
NOTE 32p.; Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies (Washington, D.C., November 4-7, 1976)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Changing Attitudes; *College Instruction; College Teachers; Curriculum Evaluation; Educational Experiments; Educational Problems; Evaluation Methods; *Faculty; Higher Education; Inservice Teacher Education; *Instructional Improvement; Models; *Political Science; Program Descriptions; Skill Development; Social Sciences; *Staff Improvement; Teacher Evaluation; Teacher Improvement; Universities

ABSTRACT

An effort to create a successful faculty development program in political science is described. Intended as a program of faculty renewal which would affect the real lives and interests of faculty members, the program is based on the contributions of one education faculty member who joined and interacted intensely with a university political science faculty for two years. The first section of the report was written by an administrator. It discusses the nature of the subject matter taught in political science, its effect on faculty needs and interests, the structural realities of the classroom in the mid-1970s, student perceptions of faculty, reward systems within the university, and the dilemma facing administrators as they allocate funds. The second section, written from the educator's point of view, describes the experiment. It discusses the attempt to gain legitimacy for the political science faculty; methods of dealing with student performance, teaching problems, and course structure; troubleshooting models; teaching improvement minicourses; evaluation of programs; and establishment of a clearinghouse to promote collegial support. Preliminary evaluation indicates that faculty members involved in the program have begun to diagnose problem areas, develop new teaching skills, and have experienced a resurgence of interest in teaching. (Author/DB)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED133255

PARTNERSHIP MODELS FOR FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

Ann S. Ferren
Louise G. White

SP009666

Paper presented at the National Council for the Social Studies, 56th Annual Meeting, November 1976, Washington, D. C.

A PARTNERSHIP MODEL FOR FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

A recent review of a book on faculty renewal concludes that faculty development projects have had little success, and that the result is not surprising. The reason suggested is that "so little of it is arranged in a way that affects the real lives and interests of the faculty members."[1] For those who have an intense interest in this kind of development, the conclusion is sobering. Assuming that the diagnosis is correct, is it possible to plan a program which does this, which addresses the "real lives and interests of faculty?"

The following report describes one effort to develop a program with this aim. In many respects it draws on efforts tried elsewhere. In its central focus, however, it is fairly unusual. The program was based on the contributions of a single resource person, a professional educator. And it was concentrated within a single discipline, political science. This structure encouraged a highly professional approach, and also an intense involvement in a natural cluster of faculty. Instead of a traditional fare of externally planned "show and tell" sessions, it brought the educator onto the staff of a department. This integration assured an attention to the "real interests" of the faculty. At the time of this writing the program consists of two years of trial and error efforts, and two months of formal reality. The educator has been hired at one-third of her time to implement a program planned jointly with the Associate Dean of the department. The first part of the report is by the administrator, and reflects on the realities of university life, and their implications for faculty. The second section is presented

---

[1] Jeffrey Lant, "Will Teachers Ever Learn?" The Chronicle of Higher Education, October 11, 1976, p. 16.

from the educator's view, and describes the substance of what was tried.

A View of Faculty Needs From the Perspective of the Discipline

What are the concerns of faculty members? What is the reality of teaching political science at the university level? To answer this requires a careful analysis of the context within which faculty teach and live out their professional lives. First, what is the nature of the subject matter, and how does that affect faculty needs and interests? Second, what are the structural realities of the classroom in the mid-1970s which have an impact on teaching? Third, and closely related, is how students perceive the role of the faculty, and what demands they place on college teachers. Fourth, but perhaps most important, what are the realities of institutional priorities, and the reward system within the University? And finally, what are the dilemmas which face administrators as they choose how many resources to put into faculty development? By briefly sketching out each of these facets of university life, two points will be made: first, an appreciation of the complexities involved in any such program, and why they often result in minimal success; and second, some indications of the direction such programs must take if they are to succeed in addressing faculty needs.

Political Science. What is it that we teach as political scientists? One characteristic is a lack of agreement on what is included in our subject matter. Some focus on presenting historical material, or on normative theory; others on analytical or practical skills; and others on descriptive material designed to acquaint

students with events in the political arena. Another way of saying this is to note that we represent the full spectrum of variation, from liberal arts courses, to professionally oriented ones.

Coincident with this reality of a plurality of approaches, is the fact that our discipline is moving strongly in the direction of focussing on analytical tools, rather than solely on descriptive subject matter. What is being emphasized is the logic of analysis, the collection and sorting of data, the development of theory and hypotheses. Our professional association has invested considerable resources in developing materials of this nature. However, they are new directions which not all faculty endorse, and even if they do, not all feel adept at handling in the classroom. Even the most open are not sure that they have the skills or capacity to pursue this direction. As processes of analysis and inquiry become part of the subject matter of the discipline, the problem of methods of teaching arise. If lectures are most appropriate for presenting certain material, they may need to be supplemented by other methods when other substance is presented. The point has to be made repeatedly that there are different teaching methods appropriate to different kinds of material. But the point has to be made in a supportive manner. Faculty are generally aware that there are new teaching methods 'out there' but they are perceived as radical departures from what is usually done, or as gimmicks to be trotted out once or twice a semester. There is an acute need to show faculty how to build on their strengths, how to incorporate new insights and methods into their normal routines.

An additional emphasis is beginning to emerge in our discipline, namely a concern with the role of values. This is partly a reflection of the political climate. It is also an effort to evoke the traditional concern of politics, which was to determine the values and choices appropriate to a society. There is much malaise with the view of politics as nothing more than the registering of social forces, and a new emphasis on the values implicit in political decisions. The stage is set for a creative interaction between behavioral and normative emphases. To bring this into the classroom requires a concern for the ways in which values are learned and communicated. It requires some attention to many of the insights coming out of experiential teaching, and the applied behavioral sciences.

Tensions in the Classroom. These new directions are occurring at a time when most faculty are finding new structural problems in the classroom and new demands from students. There is much more heterogeneity in the classroom. How can one orchestrate and teach to diverse abilities and needs? Students are more output oriented, and demand constant assurance of relevance, either to careers, or to graduate school entry. A focus on the process of learning and on inquiry is harder to master than merely presenting descriptive material. Education itself is questioned; there always seems to be the need to justify what one is presenting. The liberal education of the 1960s really represented a professional version of what has been called the "Dr. Spock syndrome." Teachers, like parents, came to value themselves insofar as they turn out alert, together,

creative people. Faculty expect a lot more of themselves than merely a facility in explaining how the congressional committee system works.

What pressures do students add to this picture? Students are remarkably charitable persons; they will forgive a variety of weaknesses of presentation if they feel a faculty member and the course expectations are basically fair. Most specific complaints originate out of some feeling that exams or grading do not reflect the assignments or lectures, or that faculty do not clearly communicate what they expect. Such complaints often betray a lack of imagination by the students, but they also suggest that many students are willing to apply themselves if they know exactly what is required of them. The pressure of grades is very real, and generates in students a need to know precisely what they need to do to get a given grade. In the classroom this tension is often reflected in a tolerance of long lectures, at the same time that students are bored with discussions. The reason is that they do not accord any legitimacy to comments by their peers; when discussion starts, they lay down their pens. Some of the more creative and thoughtful faculty are not necessarily the most highly rated by students, precisely because their efforts to stimulate creative thinking merely generate insecurity. Faculty need some direct help in structuring discussions, and in clarifying their objectives for their courses, and lesson plans. Purposes are often taken for granted, but the discipline of articulating them very precisely can be very stimulating to them, and also very useful to students.

Institutional Priorities. Thus far we have looked at aspects of the discipline of political science and their implications for teaching, at classroom tensions, and student needs, all of which provide the context for faculty development. It is also useful to look at the institutional realities, at the dynamics of a department of higher learning. The assumption is that faculty will elect to spend time on improving their teaching only if some rewards exist for them to do so. Many strategies for rewarding and motivating behavior can be tried institutionally--criteria for promotion, merit pay increases, reduced teaching loads. These can be used to motivate either teaching or research. Actually much of the time it seems that negative incentives are practiced in terms of teaching. The best teachers draw the introductory courses, or the larger and more general ones. And in many departments it is these which are seen as least challenging to teach, rather than the ones which carry the most prestige. The most conscientious advisors have the most advisees. Publications, not teaching, are brought to public attention. On balance, the incentives in most institutions encourage one to be a social scientist first, and a teacher second. The only exception in our case, was the reality of student evaluations of faculty. In spite of all the inadequacies in their format, and in the validity of their measurement techniques, they are taken seriously by the faculty, and provide a real, if negative, inducement to participate in faculty development.

In asking if there was any additional way to motivate attention to teaching, we focused on the importance of personal rewards. Part

of the reality of university life is a feeling by the faculty of a lack of efficacy, and of satisfaction in their teaching performance. This low morale is a product of the tensions already outlined. There is a sense in which faculty feel they have to be the traditional Renaissance man--knowledgeable within their discipline, wise about general and related areas, committed to their students, active participants in their institutions. Recent criteria for tenure stress that teaching, research and institutional involvement are all important, and that an emphasis on one or two can not excuse inattention to the others. Such wide-ranging expectations inevitably generate frustrations. There is a need to help faculty define their priorities, and to have a mechanism whereby they can know what their strengths are. There is a need to have some specific help available to them once they define their priorities, and ascertain what they need help with.

An Administrator's Perspective. Finally, what are the questions raised by administrators as they plan faculty development? Do these give us any clues about its direction and format? A very real question is whether there is a danger of doing little more than increasing tensions among faculty? Is there a danger of heightening a consciousness of the art of teaching, with no assurance of bringing about behavioral changes? Can a program be designed to motivate the poorer teachers? If it only motivates the good teachers, and tries to make them better, is this justified? To what extent should the program be imposed, and to what extent voluntary? If there is a basically poor teacher who won't get

tenure, is it compounding the tensions by helping him to improve his teaching just enough to raise his hopes? Would a survival of the fittest strategy be more honest in the long run? Given scarce resources how valid is it to emphasize teaching? Perhaps it is valid to assume that any department needs a few excellent teachers, but is this a realistic norm for everyone?

In one sense, there are no answers to these questions, other than the conviction that those who plan faculty development programs have to be sensitive to them. In addition, reflecting on them provided some perspective for our program, and kept it within reasonable expectations. As an administrator, I was pleased if faculty felt better about their teaching, and if fewer students complained about their courses. These became more pertinent criteria, than actual increases in learning in the classroom. I also was willing to settle for a minimum level of competence from everyone and then let some put their extra energy into teaching, others into research. It would be illusory to expect that faculty, at least in a university where research is an important ingredient, will ever allow themselves to be consumed by their teaching. And as long as the university requires a variety of talents it is important that diverse skills and contributions are valued.

The Nature of the Program. If faculty development needs to take seriously the realities of the discipline, the nature of the university, the needs of students, and of faculty morale, what direction makes sense? Our premise was that the only way in which faculty development can succeed is to view it as a way to enhance

the efficacy of the faculty. The result was that it had to begin with a lot of interaction, and a lot of diagnosis, and a lot of listening. Of necessity it was a fairly "messy," ad hoc procedure. The program does not consist of a neat package of what works, and does not work, but a description of a process of suggestion, or reinforcement, of feedback. We tried a little of this, and a little of that--mostly in response to where the faculty were.

Our first task was to gain some legitimacy for the role of an educator among our faculty. It is no news that education faculty are not accorded automatic legitimacy by other disciplines. The latter are concerned with teaching insofar as it deals with subject matter, rather than with skills of presentation. For others, education is an encounter between faculty and students, which carries an almost mystical quality. For them you are born a teacher, you do not learn to be one. Because of this latent suspicion of "educators" our program would probably not have worked if it had begun with a mandate from the Dean's office. Instead it emerged out of some very informal and voluntary efforts by the education faculty member, and several people within the political science department. It began as a truly 'grass roots' effort which gained enough legitimacy at some point to be institutionalized on a temporary basis.

Our first step was to introduce Dr. Ferren to some of the faculty, and make her available to them. At this point she was not being paid. Word began to get around that here was someone with some specific insights and skills. As an administrator, when

I saw a problem where an educator could be helpful, I tried to set up a meeting with her. In this way she worked with several graduate students, with intern supervisors, with a faculty member setting up a new continuing education program, with faculty teaching methodology. The effort throughout, was to address the real interests of the faculty, to encourage and allow them to set the agenda, and then meet their specific needs as best we could.

Not only did she gain visibility in this way, but she was gaining substantial insight into our department and the nature of the subject matter. She became conversant with the dominant issues in the discipline, and with the major authors. This ability added greatly to her credibility, and meant that she could make much more useful and specific suggestions. She began to identify with the department, and to feel she had a stake in its teaching. We pursued these varied efforts over a two-year period, some voluntary, some paid for. By then we were able to make a serious proposal to bring her onto the faculty one-third time for one year. By then she was no longer an outsider, and various faculty felt an investment in bringing her onto our staff.

Have there been any administrative problems? One was the problem of confidentiality. We wanted the Dean to know how many individuals were participating, and the extent of the need for the program. Yet we did not want to imply that these faculty had "problems." We didn't want them to be penalized for needing help, and yet we wanted them to get credit for dealing with their teaching. Related to this was the constant administrative temptation to use the program as a

"bandaid" for people who obviously needed some help. Then there was the problem of how to reinforce the learning, and make sure that participation in it is as highly valued as landing a new grant. It would be easy if we could assume that participation in faculty development raised one's teaching evaluations. The fact that this has been true in several cases, does not guarantee that it is necessarily true.

Faculty Development from the Education Consultant's View. University faculty see themselves first as scholars and second as teachers; the institutional reasons for that priority system have been outlined above. In order to be realistic about our expectations for faculty development in the area of teaching, therefore, we began by surveying the current state of the art and then asked ourselves, what should political scientists know about teaching.

Observation and interviews reveal that most faculty rely on lectures as their basic teaching approach. A few try group activities at intervals and express some frustration with the time spent compared to content covered. Faculty who have a different repertoire of teaching skills are often suspect; for example, those faculty with group skills--those that teach in the organizational development program--are often criticized for not teaching substantive courses. Those faculty who try to teach rigorous courses in a lecture-demonstration mode confess that they have no way of knowing what, if anything, their students are learning until test time. Many faculty are concerned about the student reactions such as boredom, fear, and anxiety.

Given these problems of limited repertoires and limited enthusiam, what should university teachers know about teaching and feel about their teaching? Ideally, faculty should be able to identify clearly their objectives and course goals. They should be able to sequence instruction and teach basic skills if the students are lacking them. Faculty should have a broad range of approaches to select from and be able to orchestrate narrative approaches and inquiry as classed for. Faculty need to have alternative ways in which students and faculty can interact in the classroom and outside of it. They need refined interpersonal communication skills and a sophisticated understanding of group process. Faculty need a broader view of teaching materials and the opportunity to combine real world experiences with the traditional book learning.

It is appropriate to note here again, that we did not start out with an ideal design for faculty development which would respond to each of these needs. Rather we started at the point where the faculty members were and with the kinds of problems they faced and were trying to deal with. We hoped that in so doing we would be able to expand the teaching possibilities.

The problems we were responding to can be sorted into three broad categories: first, issues related to student performance in courses; second, issues related to specific teaching problems faculty members experienced; and third, issues related to the conceptual structure of a course or program. We developed nine strategies or models to respond to these problems. They range from hit-and-run trouble shooting to long range curricular renewal. They range from

one-to-one encounters to large group involvement. The strategies differ in objectives, length of service, and intensity of involvement. Each will be discussed in terms of its purpose, procedures, and impact.

Trouble Shooting. Perhaps the most sensitive area of faculty development is in providing help to individual faculty with obvious problems; yet this is the easiest place for the consultant to begin because of the ease of identifying the client and finding a focus for work. A few examples will describe this model. Note that the objectives are narrow, the time framework calls for immediate results, and much of the responsibility for development rests with the educator-supporter.

One faculty member, new to undergraduate teaching, found himself faced with an introductory survey course while his strength was in the area of experiential learning in a focused workshop setting. As he lectured he knew he wasn't communicating; he became flustered and lost his place, he repeated himself, and just waited for class to end. As he planned each class he found himself spending hours trying to read and gather material for the lecture. After three classes he knew he was in trouble and commented to the dean about it. She called me, and I quickly put into his mailbox a folder of articles on how to lecture, tips on how to organize lectures, and a survey of general problems related to this teaching approach. I then dropped around to his office. We chatted, I visited his class, held an extended conference about his lecturing, discussed his personal style of teaching so that he could see where his personality

and lecture techniques fit together, and, finally, helped him think through the next several classes. Follow-up has been limited to, "Hi! How are things going?" The key to this model is that it provides specific, on-site, immediate help with a needed skill.

Sometimes this trouble-shooting approach is not so easily focused because the faculty member does not know what the problem is. Another case illustrates a variation of this trouble shooting approach. One faculty member came to the dean just to register general depression about his teaching. His student evaluations were low; he wasn't sure where to turn. The dean notified me, and I followed up by arranging an appointment. We just talked. We engaged in no analysis of a class and no analysis of a syllabus. I basically asked what he had done over the semester that he liked and what seemed to work with the students. We explored whether there was any way of doing more of what he felt comfortable with. I tried to demonstrate that there were sound educational reasons for the success of what he described. We focused on positive matters. I helped him understand that he had good instincts about teaching and needed to use them instead of becoming immobilized by his concerns. With an improved attitude he taught summer school. We then moved into a long range model for his development. He taped classes, we analyzed them, we worked on the syllabus, discussed the readings, refined the problem sets, developed the exams. The work together paid off, for the student evaluations at the end of the summer course reflected considerable improvement across the board and very strong improvement in the specific area he had worked on. Thus, the trouble-shooting model

helped him over a bad time, and when he was ready for additional work we moved on to the standard supervisory model.

The trouble-shooting approach distinguishes itself because it is very directive. The model is based on quick solutions imposed by an outside source. The approach reduces anxiety because the most pressing immediate problems usually go away. There are clear benefits for the harrassed instructor who can get immediate relief for his symptoms. At the same time, this model does nothing for the general health of one's teaching. If the only service we offered faculty was trouble-shooting we would be doing them a disservice. The approach creates dependency and offers only temporary solutions rather than long range development. I believe the model should be used selectively.

Long Term Supervision. In contrast to the directive, focused, anxiety-reduction model described above, we also undertook a model of long term supervision which is open-ended, exploratory, and developmental. This model appears to have the greatest potential for sustained growth of university faculty. It should be noted, however, that it requires the greatest time commitment on the part of the supervisor.

The model is based on the belief that teachers who wish to explore, and perhaps change, their teaching styles need both a feedback system and a support system. Further, it is clear that teachers have different levels of awareness about what takes place in the classroom; accordingly they require different kinds of attention and support. It also assumes that teachers cannot effectively change their

behaviors until they understand what it is they presently do. Therefore, the core of this model is observation and analysis of the classroom teaching. The goal is not to evaluate the teaching behavior; rather, the purpose of observation and analysis is to explicate the behavior, in order to bring into focus what the teacher does and the apparent effects of the behavior.

The conference following the observation is aimed at supporting the teacher's analysis of his own behavior. The observer provides the data; the teacher hypothesizes about the meaning of the data. Through supported analysis, a teacher can identify the pattern in his teaching, consider whether his teaching habits support his intentions, and develop new approaches as he sees the need. Clearly, faculty could undertake some of this analysis alone, but having a supervisor intensifies the process, provides concrete information on which to base decisions, and supports sustained efforts to change teaching behavior.

Cases illustrating this model would be too lengthy to detail here, but it is important to note the apparent costs and benefits. While we have ample evidence that faculty who engage in the process have increased their interest in teaching, are more sensitive to their styles of teaching, and feel better about what they are doing, these outcomes are not without high cost to the supervisor. This is a terribly inefficient model. The supervisor must find ways to make himself available. While teachers want help, they realize they are vulnerable, and hence need some assurance that the payoff is worth it. Since this model relies on initiation by the teacher,

and confidence in the results, not all who can benefit will expose themselves.

Once involved, the supervisor must be low key, supportive, and not have a preconceived idea about what good teaching is. He must be willing to accept faculty as they are, be patient, not have time deadlines. This is an unstructured approach requiring that the supervisor follow the faculty member's lead and not push.

This model can be very trying for the supervisor, who must be endlessly flexible to meet at odd hours, attend classes, fit conferences into an already busy schedule, and be content to see little progress for periods of time. The payoff comes in terms of teachers who are willing to be responsible for their own growth and have an increased awareness of what they are doing and a growing commitment to teaching. I suspect that there is something of a Hawthorne effect here: even university faculty thrive on attention. The model is also similar to consciousness-raising programs, and once sensitized, a faculty member can never go back to his previous state.

Videotape. A logical extension of this highly personalized and intensive analysis of teaching is the use of videotape feedback. Videotape is perhaps the most powerful and unpredictable tool we have available for providing feedback on teaching. Its problems and potential videotape must be clearly understood, since we have found tape to be both instructive and destructive. In our program we have used videotape in two ways--analysis of someone else, and analysis of self.

A relatively non-threatening use of videotape is observation of someone else's teaching. All faculty are curious about how their

colleagues teach. Most report that they have never seen anyone else teach, so they are intrigued by videotapes of someone else. Viewing a tape helps dispel ideas that every teacher other than oneself is without fault. Viewers readily see approaches they like and those they would change. Videotape can go a long way toward solving the problem of isolation and lack of perspective that is part of the university teacher's life.

Videotape can also help develop analytic skills. University faculty are trained basically as scholars and not as teachers. They consequently have a hard time focusing on the many variables in the instructional process. As faculty observe videotapes, they get an overall impression and begin to ask basic questions: what is the teacher doing? What are the students doing? What is the environment of the classroom? Because we are not trying to train the viewers to become experts in classroom interaction this global perspective is sufficient. It sensitizes faculty to the variables of classroom interaction and gives them a basis for analyzing their own classes in terms of "what did I do and what response did I get?"

Another dimension which emerges while viewing videotape of others is an awareness of the impact of personality on teaching behavior. Being able to sort out the relation between content, technique, and personality helps teachers accept teaching as a unique function of who they are and sanctions the development of a personal style of teaching. Teaching can then be seen as an extension of oneself to the students, not as a series of sterile techniques.

In contrast to viewing others on tape, viewing oneself is a high impact experience. Teachers know this before they agree to be taped,

but their curiosity seems to help them over the fear of what they will discover. I am careful about who I suggest videotaping to and experience has helped me see the importance of preparing individuals for seeing themselves on tape. By anticipating the kinds of reactions they may have, I am in a position to help reduce anxiety.

Teachers first look at cosmetic aspects of their performance and find it difficult, even though prepared, not to feel threatened. The degree of congruence between what one thinks he is doing and what is revealed on the tape determines the degree of comfort the viewer feels. Most faculty report some surprise when they see themselves on tape and in the end say "I didn't love the experience, but I learned more from it than from anything else we have done."

We have just begun a third use of videotape and are not yet sure of the impact. We have taped examples of specific teaching behaviors in order to provide film for group training sessions. Professionally made protocols are available for our use but we believe that there are many advantages to giving faculty an opportunity to learn from the teaching of their own colleagues. The tapes should be readily understandable because the courses and the students will be familiar. Moreover, I anticipate that the tapes will reduce the "Yes, but. . ." syndrome whereby one dismisses part of what he is seeing on the ground that it does not match his own circumstances. These homegrown tapes will mean that teachers will observe other teachers functioning under the same constraints of rooms, scheduling, and class size that the viewer faces.

In order to gain these advantages, we have had to accept lesser quality, for the tapes are made under normal classroom conditions.

Because we do not use a studio we are limited to one portable camera, working from a fixed site, and with obvious microphones. This causes even the best teaching to appear a bit flatter on tape than the live class actually was. There are additional problems worth noting. Scheduling problems, malfunctioning equipment, and unpredictable personnel all contribute to disrupting both faculty and students in the class being taped. Despite these constraints, the ability to look at real data and keep it for later analysis far outweighs any frustrations and has far greater usefulness than simple classroom observation.

Mini-Methods Course

One of the fundamental problems facing university faculty is that they have not had a guided opportunity to think through their basic assumptions about teaching. It is difficult, therefore, to help teachers develop when much of their teaching behavior is subconscious. Under such circumstances it is time consuming and unproductive to work one-to-one grafting strategies onto a teacher who doesn't have a well thought out approach to teaching. Ofter I found I could tell someone what to do but he had no way of understanding when or why to do it. Thus, we decided to provide an opportunity for a group of faculty to start from scratch to build a good foundation--to focus on what teaching is all about.

We reduced teaching to "what do you need to know in order to survive?" The course was a minimum essentials course with two objectives: the experience would provide a core of knowledge about teaching, and would create a group with a common experience and

understanding who could communicate about teaching. The topics included, for example, alternatives to lecturing, ways of teaching writing, utilizing group process, conducting discussions, and alternative evaluation procedures.

The course met for four mornings in January between semesters. Eighteen persons took part. We took advantage of the mid-semester break and promised them that each would get an opportunity to think through his course and have a syllabus to refine by the end of the four sessions. In short, timing, relevance, and immediate payoff made this model useful to a large group of faculty. We are regularly asked whether the mini-course will be offered again.

One-Shot Seminars

Even the most conscientious of teachers finds it difficult to instruct himself about his teaching. Furthermore, faculty may hear about an idea but have no way of assessing its relevance to them. Our support system also tackled this issue and at the same time sought to further our goal of a faculty network for mutual support. In response we offered a series of no-obligation, one-shot seminars in the form of brown bag lunches with announced discussion topics and lead by the consultant.

Areas of interest to several faculty were identified by the faculty themselves. They included such topics as evaluation, role-playing, lesson planning, and use of the computer lab. Complex topics such as testing and grading are particularly well suited to exploration in a group setting. Faculty seem to benefit from hearing others explain the rationale behind assignments.

Topics such as role-playing are also suited to this model. The technique is considered by most faculty to be rather avante garde and presumably without value in their courses; and yet they have heard about role playing and want to know more. The seminar format gives them a safe setting in which to ask questions, get the information they need to understand the technique, brainstorm the possible applications, and perhaps get encouragement to try it. Hearing someone describe his experience and having the opportunity to ask questions provide a non-threatening learning environment. The educator-consultant serves as a resource, providing additional information on the pros and cons of the approach. He is also available to provide follow up support for anyone who wishes to adapt the approach to one of his own classes.

The draw backs of this model are also worth noting. We had a continually changing membership so that new persons brought up old questions. This was frustrating to those who had attended previous sessions. By not being exclusive, the seminars could not be developmental. Another concern was that since this model used a discussion format, rather than an experiential one, the seminars necessarily had limited impact.

Curriculum Renewal

Many of the expressed concerns about teaching are related to the structure of a course or program. About one third of my time has been spent on careful examination of curricula which have apparent problems. In one case I have served as an "arm chair quarterback" available for consultation as the course is taught

this Fall. The Introduction to American Government course relies on senior teaching assistants for a one day a week field experience in Washington, D.C. Over the years there have been a number of problems; for example, lack of articulation between field experience and the regular classroom and variable motivation and performance of students in the program. This semester I have been available to work with the teaching assistants to help them develop the specific teaching skills needed for their part of the program. More important, I have been an outside observer of the way in which the program functions and will at the end of the semester serve as an additional resource to the dean as she evaluates the program and makes plans for its future.

On a more extensive level, our curriculum renewal effort has focused on the complete planning of a methodology program. During an intensive six week summer seminar we planned the program and I am working now with a small group of faculty writing an extensive and detailed two course sequence. We began with an analysis of the students taking the courses, established the objectives, designed specific classroom experiences, selected and wrote teaching materials, and explored alternative staffing patterns including team teaching and the use of graduate assistants.

The faculty are very enthusiastic about having a detailed outline available, and are putting their time and energy into executing the course, instead of into planning it. The experience has been an important one and we are so encouraged that we are exploring the possibility of undertaking the same effort with additional courses.

Evaluation of New Programs

One very specialized role for a consultant from an education department is curriculum evaluation. Our university has developed a number of new degree programs in recent years in response to perceived consumer demand. Traditionally, faculty have listed a few courses already offered, added a few new courses, determined an appropriate sequence, written a comprehensive exam if at the graduate level, and called the sequence a "new program." In an effort to provide better delivery of educational services, the director of a new masters degree program undertook a serious curricular design approach and asked me to be an important part of the process.

The program planning began with goal statements and clear objectives. The selection and development of courses followed. The consultant came into the process during the first year of the new program and served as a resource for gathering data for formative evaluation. Through questionnaires, interviews, and content analysis of written materials, data was gathered and conclusions drawn about how effective the new program was in meeting its objectives. Based on the information provided by the consultant the program was redesigned for the next year's incoming students.

The director of the program notes several clear benefits from involving a curriculum specialist in this program development process. First, it helped to clarify the goals of the program and to develop alternative ways of achieving them. Second, the evaluation instruments provide tools for monitoring the program and continuing to get feedback over the years it is in operation. And

finally, it allowed the director to make substantial changes in the program so that the students in the second year of the program are having a better experience. By merging the special skills of the political scientists and the education specialist it was possible to refine and strengthen the new curriculum.

Self Help

Despite the pressures on faculty and the availability of support services, there are some faculty who are unable to engage directly with someone about their teaching. The norms of university life are such that professors do not seek public scrutiny of their teaching. The realities of university work schedules also get in the way of development efforts. Faculty work erratic schedules. They are subject to interruptions by unanticipated calls, meetings and student demands. One way faculty deal with these demands is to stay away from the unviersity. They assign some portion of their time to teaching and then stake out the rest for research and scholarly activities. They would not choose to participate in a faculty development event if it cut into their precious work time.

For those faculty handicapped by fear, time, or other unspecified constraints we designed a model for self help. We gathered materials in a series of notebooks which could be checked out for short periods of time. Each notebook contained a mixture of articles covering theory, research, and how-to-do-it tips. A cover sheet was included which offered suggestions on how to use the materials and how to undertake self diagnosis where relevant.

The notebook on Discussions and Group Process, for example, suggests taping a class and then analyzing the interaction by using

a checklist included in the notebook. The notebook on Course Planning includes an article describing how to use a systems approach. The notebook on Teacher-Student Interaction included several training exercises designed to improve interpersonal communication skills.

It is safe to assume that few faculty would go out on their own to read about teaching issues. They need available materials which have been selected to assure usefulness. Faculty want a clear payoff for their efforts. A useful role the educator can play is to bring to faculty such materials. It has been interesting to discover that time is the determining variable in faculty development. If we could just boil everything about teaching down to one page, all faculty would participate.

This self-help model needs further exploration. I suspect we will find that this is a first stage or entry level for some faculty. If they experience some payoff for their expenditures of time then they will be amenable to other faculty development activities.

Clearing House

There are numerous successful teaching efforts and innovative courses on any campus, but the university structure does not encourage others to know about them. Scholarly efforts are publicized, but not teaching successes. As part of any faculty devleopment effort, some sort of clearing house on teaching activities is needed.

As I hear a faculty members express an idea, I mention others who share his concern. If several faculty have a common problem, I try to get them in touch with each other. If one professor's

syllabus would be helpful to another I being it to him. I comment on assignments others have used successfully. This is an informal procedure for trying to open and maintain lines of communication between faculty about teaching. (It has been important to make sure that nothing in my manner or tone suggests gossip, for this would undermine all my efforts.) The purposes of this model are to provide specific help, reduce faculty isolation, and promote collegial support. The benefits are hard to measure.

The Realities of Faculty Development

After such a lengthy narrative outlining our models I would like to be able to say with confidence that there is a great population out there teaching in institutions of higher learning who are eager, willing, and waiting for such services. Further, I wish I could say that if educators just made themselves available the problems outlined at the beginning of this paper would be resolved. Unfortunately, the realities of faculty development are clear.

There are many hardworking faculty who would like to be more effective teachers but they cannot or will not find the time to learn what they need to know in order to improve. Further, faculty have work habits designed to accommodate many types of activities, but if you want to work with them it must be on their time.

Faculty are used to making last minute changes and cancelling appointments in order to follow up on other opportunities, and all your well meaning overtures will get lost in the shuffle. It is hard to demand the keeping of an appointment to discuss last week's teaching when the teacher has an opportunity to meet downtown to

discuss next week's consulting job. The faculty member would never view the missed appointment as a lost opportunity.

It takes an incredibly organized yet flexible person to do this job. You must keep schedules, write notes, carry a calendar, enjoy the telephone, make friends with the support services in the university, and carry through most projects. There appears to be a real limit on how much of the responsibility for initiating faculty development efforts can be shifted to the faculty. My observations suggest that those who wish to work on their teaching are already doing so and that their work pays off. It is the other faculty on whom we wish to focus our energies. How to provide services to those who will not make the first move is not an easily answered question.

The many frustrations of the job raise the question whether there are enough benefits to the consultant to outweigh the costs. To a very limited extent the monetary benefits are important. More important is the personal pleasure that comes from being part of another's significant effort to change and grow. The real payoff, however, comes in the form of my own professional development. The opportunity to work in an academic department keeps me aware of current developments in the field, maintains my familiarity with the literature, and stretches my mind to accommodate new subject matter. Few specialists in education have the opportunity to maintain such an intensive involvement in the academic area they teach about. My methods' students benefit, my student teachers benefit, and the teachers I work with in secondary schools benefit.

Preliminary Evaluation From the Perspective of the Political Scientist. At the time of this writing, the program has only been institutionalized for two months. The evidence by which to evaluate it is based on interviews, and informal impressions, and is overwhelmingly positive. It appears that an external resource recognized as a professional educator, yet sensitive to another discipline, can be accepted and used with good results.

In a department of 35 faculty, 15 teaching graduate students, several adjuncts, and different programs to be thought through and evaluated, our educator has had far more demands on her than she can meet. She has observed classes and given feedback to 7 faculty (some more than once), 2 adjuncts, and 4 graduate students. She has had individual conferences with 8 faculty and 6 adjuncts, and video taped three classes. Because the structure of the program caters to faculty needs and schedules, it is true that her time is often not efficiently used. The major demand for her help has come from two groups: first, a few whose evaluations are low, and face tenure or promotion; second, a larger group of good teachers who have specific problems to deal with, or just want to improve.

In terms of what has been most helpful, it has been particularly successful for those who have had individual consultations, or whose classes have been observed. Four patterns have emerged: Faculty have begun to identify some things they do well; a few were willing to be taped. Second, they are learning to diagnose areas where they need help, and even more important to perceive there are new skills they can learn. At least six have experimented with variations

on the way they conduct class, and have been pleased with the results. Faculty have stopped me in the hall to say they divided their class into discussion groups, and the result was that the students got so involved, the class went overtime.

Third, our effort to pull together faculty teaching similar courses, to develop a model syllabus, has been a great success. Not only has the specific syllabus been used with good reports, but faculty are beginning to consider working together to develop their courses. Finally, yet more subtly there is evidence of a new interest in teaching. Faculty discuss teaching over lunch. They talk about their classes with administrators. They evidence a surprised pleasure that resources have been devoted to meeting their immediate needs. In conclusion it has been a very positive and useful experience for me to have an outsider asking questions about our curriculum, its priorities, and resources. By bringing a perspective from outside our department, and a repertoire of observational skills, she has enabled me to function more effectively.